

REMARKS

Claims 21, 30 and 31 have been objected to due to informalities. The claims have been amended accordingly

Claims 29, 30 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 29 and 30 have been amended. Clearly, the assignment of internal logical networks by a table or algorithm is understood. In any event, the claim has been modified to recite “at least one of” the table and algorithm. Claim 39 does not appear to use the “or” language. Otherwise, the claims are readily understood given their dependency, for example, from claim 28 and 38.

Claims 21-24 and 28-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Rose. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants provide the following comments in response to the Office Action, and in particular, the comments by the Examiner made in the “Response to Arguments” section in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Office Action.

The current invention relates to a network node or exchange and to an ability to add exchanges in the network, such that the exchanges have the same signaling point code as other exchanges in the network. Referring to the example shown in Figure 1, there is a first network node B_{Vst} has two internal logical networks N1 and N2. A signaling connection S1 is set up from the second internal logical network N2 to another network A_{Vst} in the telecommunication network. Signaling of the network node A_{Vst} occurs via signaling connection S1, whereby both network nodes B_{Vst} and A_{Vst} have the same signaling point code SPC.

Rose, on the other hand, discloses an exchange for a communication network in which a plurality of nodes for processing calls from or to a first neighboring exchange are deployed, in which two or more of the nodes are arranged to be connected to the first neighboring exchange by separate trunk routes, and a signaling point code being assigned to the node-end of each trunk route. The signaling point codes assigned to the node-ends of the separate trunk routes to the first neighboring exchange differ from each other (see abstract).

In the claimed invention, on the other hand, the network nodes have the same signaling point code. Hence, while the various nodes in Rose utilize different signaling point codes (X, Y), *no two nodes utilize the same signaling point code when communicating with an exchange*. Rose therefore fails to disclose the claimed limitation of a signaling connection that is set up from the second internal logical network to another network node of the telecommunication network, via

which signaling connection all signaling of the another network node is done, wherein both network nodes have the same signaling point code, as required by the claimed invention (see, for example, claim 21).

The Examiner alleges that Rose discloses multiple nodes in a distributed signaling exchange, wherein each node comprises multiple trunk routes (Figure 5) that are allegedly equivalent to the internal logical networks of claim 21. The Examiner further comments that, as shown in Figure 5, the trunk routes connect the nodes of the distributed exchange to neighboring exchanges as well as to other nodes within the distributed signaling exchange. According to the Examiner, each of the nodes within the distributed signaling exchange maintain data tables that allow it to send signaling messages to other nodes in the exchange (paragraph [0085]), therefore supporting signaling of the other nodes. The Examiner concludes that the signaling point codes (X, Y) are shared by nodes within the distributed exchange. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rose clearly shows, for example in Figures 5 and 6, and paragraph [0085], that the distributed exchange comprises nodes, each of which having different point codes, i.e. in Figure 5 node p provides point codes X, Y and Y, node q provides point codes Y and X and node r provides point codes X, X and Y. The respective point code depends upon an exchange that is connected to the respective node via a particular trunk. In other words, the exchange A is connected via trunk route A-X to node p and via trunk route A-Y to node q. The exchange A is not at all connected to node r. However, exchanges B, C and D are connected to node r. The claimed invention, on the other hand, allows replacing an existing exchange by a new exchange, wherein such replacement does not have to be sudden. Rather, both exchanges (the existing and the new one) may be operational during a transition phase. Hence, the new exchange can be operational without having to adjust all routing information and/or tables at other exchanges. This is in particular useful if the new exchange is only present during a transition phase.

According to the present invention, this is achieved by supplying one (i.e. the same) signaling point code for both such exchanges, i.e., the existing exchange as well as the new exchange. It is thus decisive that the other exchanges or network components are aware of only one logical entity via this signaling point code. Hence, such other exchanges or network components may address this signaling point code without any necessity for them being aware of the fact that there may be deployed two (or more) actual exchanges beyond such signaling point

code. Accessing the logical entity or exchange can be done via the signaling point code. There is no further signaling point code provided for the new or temporary exchange (or network node).

Rose simply fails to disclose that two network nodes share the same (a single) signaling point code. Moreover, Rose suggests addressing particular point codes at nodes p, q and r via trunk routes. Such trunk routes do not exist in the claimed invention. In contrast to Rose, a benefit of being able replacing an existing exchange or adding another exchange is to not having to broadcast additional point code information. The process of accessing the exchange – according to the invention – is transparent to the adjacent nodes, because they are not aware of any additional node or exchange encapsulated within the sphere of the “same” signaling point code.

Claims 25-27, 30-34, and 38-40 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over various combinations of Rose, Okanoué, Havansi, Segal, Doshi and Gavaras. The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons presented in the arguments above, and since neither Okanoué, Havansi, Segal, Doshi nor Gavaras disclose the claimed features.

Entry of this amendment after final is appropriate since it amends the claims to overcome objections and rejections under 35 USC 112. In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No. 119010-014.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak

Reg. No. 43,148

Customer No. 29177

Dated: May 28, 2008